

REMARKS

After the above-requested amendments, Claims 13, 16-22, 24-33, 44 and 47-52 are pending. For the reasons explained below, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance.

I. Response to Objection to and Rejection of Claim 13

Claim 13 stands objected to because of certain informalities which the Examiner raised. Applicants have amended Claim 13 following the suggestion of the Examiner and therefore the objection has been overcome.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Song et al. (US 6,163,356) in view of Kaneko. Claim 13 has been amended to recite "depositing using a sputtering process a third conductive layer formed of an indium zinc oxide (IZO) layer ... , wherein the sputtering process is performed at a temperature below 200° C". Support for the amendment is found in the specification on page 13 beginning at line 11 and extending through page 14, line 8. Applicants submit that none of the cited art discloses or suggest the newly cited features of Claim 13 and, accordingly, request that the rejection be withdrawn. Claims 16-18, 47-19 and 51-52 which depend directly, or through other claims, on Claim 13 which is now in condition for allowance, are also in condition for allowance for at least the reason of dependency.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants request that the rejection of the foregoing claims be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

II. Response to Rejection of Claims 19-22 and 24-33

The above-identified claims stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant claims as the invention. The errors which the Examiner pointed in Claim 19 have been corrected by substituting for "silicon nitride", the phrase "gate insulating". With this change, the appropriate antecedent basis is established. Applicants appreciate the

Examiner's noting of this inadvertent error on part of Applicants. With the change noted above in Claim 19, the rejection of Claims 21-22 and 24-33 is also overcome.

On page 11 of the outstanding office action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 19-22 and 24-33 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, in light of the amendment to Claim 19, Claims 19-22 and 24-33 are not in condition for allowance and Applicants respectfully request such action.

Newly presented Claim 50, which is dependent on Claim 19, is condition for allowance and patentable over the art for at least the reason of the dependency on allowable Claim 19. Accordingly, Applicants request allowance of Claim 50.

III. Allowability of Claim 44

The Examiner indicated on page 11 of the open office action that Claim 44 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended Claim 44 to include the limitations of Claim 13 as presented in the amendment filed June 28, 2006. Accordingly, Claim 44 is now in condition for allowance and Applicants respectfully request such action.

CONCLUSION


In light of the foregoing, all of the claims currently pending in the application are ready for allowance and Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed and the case passed to issue. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns or care to discuss the application, he is requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 392-9250.

MacPherson Kwok Chen & Heid
LLP
2033 Gateway Place, Suite 400
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone: (408) 392-9250
Facsimile: (408) 392-9262

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO.

EV 947 395 645 US

Respectfully submitted,



David W. Heid
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 25,875